Ct Cases / 59143/2024

AMITA SACHDEVA Vs. STATE AND ORS /0 (Parliament

Street)

20.01.2025

Present: Sh. Makrand Adkar, Ld. Counsel for complainant

through VC.

Sh. Yadavendra Saxena, Sh. Vikram Kumar, Sh.

Shantanu Adkar, Ld. Counsel for complainant.

Complainant in person.

ATR filed on behalf of IO. Same is taken on record.

As per the ATR, the IO has already seized CCTV footage and the NVR of Delhi Art Gallery. It is further stated in the ATR that a list of painting was provided by Delhi Art Gellery in which the painting in question are mentioned at Sl. No. 6 and 10. It is further stated in the inquiry report that exhibition was held in a private space and the said paintings were only to display the original work of authors/artists.

At this stage an application U/s 94 BNSS has been moved by complainant for direction to the IO to seize the painting in question.

In light of the facts and circumstances mentioned in the said application, the said application is allowed and IO is directed to seize the said painting a file a report on 22.01.2025.

Put up for compliance report and arguments on 22.01.2025.

Copy of the order be given dasti, as prayed.

(Sahil Monga) JMFC-06/PHC/ND/20.01.2025